



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,414	11/18/2003	Thomas W. Stone	10010940-1	7247

7590 11/01/2005
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL 429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER

LU, TONY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2878

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FL

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/717,414	Applicant(s) STONE, THOMAS W.	
	Examiner Tony Lu	Art Unit 2878	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/18/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Figures 1a, 1b and 2 should be labeled Prior Art. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9,11,13,14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stone et al US5692077.

With respect to claim 7, Stone et al disclose an optical routing system comprising a routing system capable of receiving an input electromagnetic radiation beam(input optical carrier) along an input direction and providing at least one output electromagnetic radiation beam(output optical carrier); and a beam diffraction element(230) optically disposed on an output side of the routing optical system and aligned to receive the at least one output electromagnetic radiation beam, the beam diffraction element being capable of selectively directing the at least one output electromagnetic radiation beam in order to render a direction of propagation of the selectively diffracted at least one output electromagnetic radiation beam substantially parallel to the input direction(fig.13).

With respect to claim 8, per the above discussion, Stone et al disclose the optical routing system further comprising a beam steering diffraction element(220) optically disposed before the routing optical system and capable of receiving the input electromagnetic radiation beam and steering the input electromagnetic radiation beam to the routing optical system.

With respect to claim 9, per the above discussion, Stone et al disclose the beam diffraction element comprises a diffraction grating(col.13).

With respect to claim 11, per the above discussion, Stone et al disclose the diffraction grating comprises a switched grating(fig.13).

With respect to claim 13, per the above discussion, Stone et al disclose the steering diffraction element comprises a diffraction grating(col.13).

With respect to claim 14, per the above discussion, Stone et al disclose the beam diffraction element comprises a diffraction grating(col.13).

With respect to claim 16, per the above discussion, Stone et al disclose the diffraction grating comprises a switched grating(fig.13).

Stone et al inherently performs the claimed method steps(claims 1-6, note that 234 is an active/passive crosstalk suppressor, see fig.13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10,12,15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone et al US5692077.

With respect to 10,12,15, and 17, per the above discussion, Although Stone et al lack a clear inclusion of the diffraction grating comprises a pixellated diffraction grating and/or a pixellated switched grating, selecting a specific type of gratings would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to provide a better control to the modulation of the electromagnetic radiation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Stone et al accordingly in order to provide a better control to the

modulation of the electromagnetic radiation entering and/or leaving the optical routing system.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

1) Stone et al US5982515 disclose an optical routing system having switchable gratings.

2) Heritage et al US4655547 disclose an optical pulse shaping system comprising numbers of diffraction gratings for routing an input electromagnetic radiation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Lu whose telephone number is 5712728448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am- 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on 5712722444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tony Lu".A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David Porta".

DAVID PORTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800